

NEW NATIONAL ERA.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS,
Editor and Publisher.

All Communications and Business Letters should be addressed to FREDERICK DOUGLASS, Editor and Publisher, New National Era, Lock Box 31, Washington, D. C. This paper is not responsible for the views expressed by Correspondents.

Mr. Lewis W. Stevenson is a duly authorized General Agent for the New National Era in the State of Texas.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1870.

The undersigned has purchased the New NATIONAL ERA, and the Printing Establishment on Eleventh street, where the paper is published. He will hereafter be its Editor and Publisher. All letters and other papers, whether intended for its columns or remittances in payment of subscriptions, should be addressed to—

FREDERICK DOUGLASS,
Lock Box 31, Washington, D. C.

EXTRA OFFER!

GOOD ONLY TO JANUARY 1, 1871.
NOW IS THE TIME TO SUBSCRIBE.

We will send both the NEW NATIONAL ERA and the American Agriculturist one year to every subscriber who shall forward us \$3 before the first of January next. All orders mailed prior to that date will be included in this offer.

The New National Era Free!

We will send our paper free until the 1st of January next to all subscribers who forward us \$2.50 for the year 1871 before the 15th of December.

Subscription Price of the New National Era.

PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

1 copy one year.....	\$2 50
1 copy six months.....	1 25
1 copy three months.....	65
5 copies one year.....	10 00
5 copies six months.....	5 50
10 copies one year.....	20 00
10 copies six months.....	10 00

Do not delay subscribing. If it is not convenient to subscribe for a year, send \$1.25 for six months. If it costs a little personal sacrifice the investment will pay.

To prevent loss send all money in Post Office Orders, Registered Letters, or Drafts.
ALL POSTMASTERS ARE OBLIGED TO REGISTER LETTERS WHENEVER REQUESTED TO DO SO.
The fee for registering is fifteen cents.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS,
Lock Box 31, Washington, D. C.

The Speech of Carl Schurz.

The speech of CARL SCHURZ in the Senate on Wednesday last week, vindicating his political course in Missouri last fall, was the marked feature of the week at the Capitol. It was our privilege to hear the Missouri Senator in his own defence. His speech was, as we had reason to believe it would be, a splendid oration. Viewed as a work of art it was a model, and proved its author a master. His subtle intellectual power over men was manifest and striking throughout. To charm the American Senate into perfect silence is an achievement seldom accomplished by any speaker.

In one sense, Mr. Schurz was on trial, and had to be his own advocate. He stood at the bar of the Senate and the nation to show cause why a sentence of condemnation should not be pronounced against him. His political life was at stake. The charge against him was a hateful one, nothing less than the basest treachery to the party to which he professed to belong—a party that has trusted him and covered him with honors at home and abroad. It is alleged that while standing as a sentinel he had betrayed the camp of his friends into the hands of their bitterest enemies. In the effort to clear his otherwise fair fame of such a blot we, at least, wished him success; for, as we have said in a previous number, CARL SCHURZ has long been one of our political idols.

Sensible of the considerable task before him, Mr. Schurz had evidently prepared himself with the utmost skill and care. For more than two mortal hours, almost without break or pause, he poured out a rapid stream of statesmanlike philosophy, learning, logic, and eloquence. As an intellectual effort there was nothing missing. The gilded splendors of intellect and rhetoric may dazzle for the moment, but the simple truth alone endures.

Well, how was it with General Schurz in the enduring light of truth? We will tell you freely, though we tell you sadly. Brilliant as this man's speech was, when viewed as a mere intellectual effort, it was, when viewed in the sober light of truth, a most miserable failure. CARL SCHURZ is to-day as much an object of doubt, suspicion, and distrust as before he made that speech. Not a single cloud has been lifted from his horizon. His speech was composed of a series of splendid assaults upon positions which nobody defended or wished to defend.

Nobody has ever complained that he sought to extinguish, in the State of Missouri or elsewhere, the fiery animosities kindled during the late rebellion; hence down goes his skillfully arranged exordium. Nobody has denied that the objects and principles of a party have higher claims to our allegiance than the party organization itself; hence all the lofty sentiment at this point avails him nothing, for it does not touch the point at issue. Nobody contends that the object of a party should simply be its own perpetuation; hence the fine warning at this point did not touch anywhere. Finally, nobody has asked of Mr. Schurz or anybody else to stand by the Republican party to the hurt of his personal honor. All the fine things said on these points were dust and smoke, which, though blinding for the moment, do not last long. Neither these nor the matter of amnesty have anything to do with the question which separates Mr. Schurz from his Republican associates in Missouri. The Republican party in Missouri and elsewhere have strongly enough and often enough indicated its purpose to proclaim, just so soon as it is wise and safe, a general amnesty to the late rebels. The difference upon which Mr. Schurz bolted from his Republican associates and united with the Democrats of Missouri to defeat the regular Republican nominee does not even involve the question of the time when it will be proper to extend suffrage to the late rebels of that State. There was on that point no party test whatever.

That question was left to the decision of each member of the party without trammel or dictation from any quarter. At this same election, where Mr. Schurz and his friends worked the mischief to the Republican party, the question of amnesty or enfranchisement was submitted to a separate vote. The question was put outside of party politics, and made a matter of individual conscience and judgment. Thus it will be seen that there

is no ground whatever to support this pernicious blot from the Republican party. Assuming the entire honesty of Mr. Schurz, the only cause he can bring for himself is that he was in hot haste to do at once what his own political friends were already doing deliberately. There was no principle involved. The question was simply one of urgency or no urgency, but all occurred in the wisdom of the measure sought. Yet this man bolts away from his party, forms an alliance with its enemies, and defeats its candidates, on no better pretext than that his party was tardy and he is in a hurry. This is the true statement of the case, and no sophistry can render it unintelligible. In view of it, we are forced to the conclusion, though reluctantly, that Mr. Schurz has been both false and cruel in turning his batteries upon his own friends in Missouri. He must find other and more powerful reasons for his defection than he has yet given before he can be safely trusted as a political associate.

Mr. Schurz made a telling point in his speech upon the sacredness of his honor and the obligation to comply with one's own pledged faith. This is the divine side of poor human nature, and it is quite easy to grow eloquent and sublime while speaking of such a theme, and hence Mr. Schurz was eloquent when he spoke of his honor. Let us examine for a moment this point of honor, and see if it does not, like all the rest, fade in the cold, clear light of truth.

Mr. Schurz takes shelter under the National Republican Convention which adopted a resolution favoring amnesty. He claims that he was only carrying out a great Republican purpose and a solemn pledge given by the party. He tells us that when he makes a promise he is bound to perform it. All of which is very good, and upon first blush it will be accepted as sound doctrine, but has no proper connection to the case in hand.

Let us admit that the National Convention that nominated General Grant pledged itself to support the policy of enfranchising rebels as soon as the public safety should permit the carrying out of that policy; and suppose Mr. Schurz was a member of that Convention, and spoke and voted in favor of that policy, in what manner and to what extent is Mr. Schurz reasonably bound by such action? We shall see.

Disregarding the moral philosophy of the Senator from Missouri, we will give our readers our own moral theory in regard to the case in hand. First, the pledge, if there was any given, was not in the shape of a personal pledge. It was a pledge made by a party. It was not the pledge of CARL SCHURZ, but the pledge of the Republican party. He was in no sense a party to that pledge other than as a member of the Republican party. The pledge was given in that sense, and taken in that sense, and is binding in that sense, and in no other sense is it binding. We contend that Mr. Schurz would have done his whole duty had he remained in the Republican party and continued to speak and vote for the enfranchisement of the rebels. There was nothing in the resolution of the Republican Convention which bound its members to break away from the party in order the better to carry out its policy and purposes. Any other view of a party pledge would be not only glaringly absurd, but absolutely suicidal. No party could hang together a day upon the opposite theory.

The splendid plea made by Mr. Schurz, to the effect that he has made a promise he is in honor bound to perform, is entirely sound, supposing that the performance depends upon himself alone, and is within the limits of his ability; but, as already implied, when he makes a promise which is subject to his connection with other men, and which, in the nature of it, must needs be performed in conjunction with other men, he is clearly bound by his promise only in the same manner and to the same extent the other parties to the promise are bound. It was not Mr. CARL SCHURZ, but the National Republican party that made the promise of amnesty. This is the sense in which the pledge was made and received by the country. The most sensitive conscience in the Convention never dreamed that the pledge to favor amnesty bound the members of the Convention to seek that object outside the party. We venture to assert that not even Mr. Schurz at that time dreamed of such an interpretation of that obligation.

The Republican party has not confined its pledges simply to amnesty; it has pledged itself to the payment of the national debt, and to many other things. What duties do these pledges impose on the individual members of the party? Simply this: for each individual in the party to do what he can inside the party to keep his party up to the work of performing its avowed pledges. When any member of the party has done this, or is doing this, his honor is safe and beyond impeachment.

When a man makes a promise which is understood that he means to perform in connection with other men, he is bound in a double sense—first, to those who are to perform the promise, and, secondly, to those to whom the promise is made, and his pledged faith is no more sacred in the one direction than in the other. This is too plain to need an argument.

But how does this place Mr. Schurz? How does his nice sense of honor stand this test? Is his honor wounded by delay in fulfilling his promise to the disfranchised rebels of Missouri, while he violently breaks faith with loyal associates? Were his obligations to the enemies of the country more sacred than were his obligations to his friends? Shall we have respect—can we have respect for such a man's sense of honor? No, Mr. Schurz. Say you have blundered—say you have made a mistake, or say you have two kinds of honor, one for your friends, which is weak and very much confused, and another for your enemies, which is strong and clear and wonderfully sensitive. Not by our rule, but by your own rule, you stand before the country either as a weak man or as a man without political integrity. The glorious eulogium pronounced in your speech on the claims of personal honor are shown in your case to have been little better than a hollow mockery.

It is unnecessary, after what has now been said, to criticize the remarks of the Missouri Senator on the subject of a new party. It was evident from those remarks that Mr. Schurz is expecting a new party, either to spring from the Republican party or from the Democratic party, or from both; but when that party shall come, how it shall come, and what will be its mission when it does come, he does not know. It may come soon, or it may come late; and the only thing about which Mr. Schurz seems certain is that the party will come at some time or another. We confess that Mr. Schurz was less instructive than entertaining in this part of his great speech. One thing, however, was very obvious in all that he said on the subject, and that was, that he himself was already for the new party. A more unenviable state of mind for a public man can scarcely be conceived. He is neither one thing nor another; neither "fish, fish, nor fowl." Today he is a Republican, to-morrow he expects to be something else. At Washington he is a friend to General Grant's administration; in Missouri he is in sweet communion with the Democratic party. Mr. SCHURZ is an able man,

and a man whose instincts and tendencies are too progressive and noble to stand where he now does long. He will either shake himself loose from his late Democratic alliance or go with that party altogether.

Catholicism Versus Republicanism.

We remember to have read an article, some years ago, in a paper published in Bogota, under the heading, "Can a Roman Catholic be a true Republican?" It was a long and well-written article, and the author demonstrated by logical and convincing arguments that the absolute and blind submission of the devout Catholic to utterly conflicting with the duties of the citizen of a republic, that as long as he submits to that authority, which in itself is the very antagonism of the spirit of republicanism, he never can be a true republican citizen. The very fact that he must be ready to desert the cause of his country when ordered to do so by his Church incapacitates him for that position from the outset. On the other side, it follows, necessarily, that in the proportion he becomes imbued with republican ideas, and makes them the rule of his actions, he can no longer remain the faithful son of the Church. The friend who sent us the paper had written on the margin that the Archbishop of Bogota had excommunicated not only the author of the article and the publisher of the paper, but every one who would circulate it, as well as all its readers. We were forcibly reminded of that article, and its truth, by the protests forthcoming from all directions of the world, where there is a Catholic Church, against the action of VICTOR EMANUEL and the Italian people in depriving the Holy Father of the last vestige of his temporal power. Among them those from our own country are perhaps more numerous than from any other, and of late hardly a day went by without bringing the reports of meetings called for that purpose, and of the resolutions adopted. Among those who made themselves conspicuous in these demonstrations we notice not only the highest ecclesiastical dignitaries, but also quite prominent lawyers and judges, mostly of Irish descent. The addresses themselves do not materially differ from each other, no matter whether they originated in New York, Boston, or anywhere else. They all express unconditional condemnation of the Italians and their king, and deep sympathy with the Pope in his affliction.

Now, as far as practical results are concerned, those addresses are as harmless as any letter of condolence to a man on the death of a relative or the loss of his fortune, for they will not bring back one buffalo in the Campagna di Roma, under the supremacy of his Holiness; and if they serve as a gratification to the old gentlemen, we are very willing to let them enjoy it. Differently, however, stands the case with those legal gentlemen who aspire for any lucrative office within the tender of the sovereign people while evincing a spirit the very reverse of republican, besides indulging in doctrines which, though too gross to deceive an enlightened people, tell heavily against their truthfulness. They know very well that VICTOR EMANUEL, by no means took possession of Rome by any arbitrary act of his own; that, on the contrary, he was virtually compelled to do so by the unanimously expressed will of the whole Italian people, the inhabitants of the States of the Church included, who would have thrown off the yoke of the Pope long ago if it had not been for the presence of French bayonets. The Italian people have thus done precisely the same thing that he did when we renounced the allegiance to GEORGE III. and the same thing that those gentlemen themselves would have done, and very justly so, long before they came to our hospitable shores, if only they had had the power to accomplish it; namely, to achieve their independence of English supremacy. No one can reasonably contend that PRINCE DE VICTOR derived his temporal power any more from the consent of the Roman people than Queen VICTORIA derives hers from the consent of the Irish people, those honorable gentlemen included.

There is no more foundation in the assertion that the Pope is deprived of the liberty to fulfill all the functions and discharge the duties of his office hereafter as heretofore. He is as much as he ever was the infallible head of the Church for those who bow before him as such. He can bless and excommunicate, canonize and anathematize as much as ever. The difference lies only in the fact that he has no longer the power to give material consequences to his decrees. He can no longer effectually prohibit any other kind of worship save that of the Catholic Church within the precincts of Rome. He neither can shut up the Jews in a filthy ghetto, nor kidnap their children in order to have them brought up in the "true faith." To be sure he has yet the right to prohibit heretical books and put them on the Index, but he can no longer enjoy the innocent pleasure to have them publicly burnt once a year. He can neither imprison dangerous heretics in convents and make them disappear as if it were from the face of the earth. We, with our simple republican notions of religious liberty and toleration, certainly can only rejoice that there should be an end to those horrors, the remnants of darker ages; but those reverend and honorable gentlemen show by their howling and wailing that they think them indispensable to the glory of the Church, and thus virtually, though indirectly, give us to understand that they would like to have us treated just the same as other heretics were treated under the rule of the Holy Father.

However, as we said before, all addresses in the world can do nothing to inhale new life to the stone-dead temporal power of the Pope; yet, as those gentlemen are so desirous of showing him their good intentions, we shall assist them by some good advice. Why don't they invite his Holiness to turn his back on unfortunate Rome and come to the United States? We have no doubt he would prove a success. Our large Irish population, as a matter of course, would be ecstatic and rapturous; indeed, there is hardly any event next to the bodily arrival of the Virgin Mary in the first cabin of a steamer that would produce such outbursts of religious enthusiasm as the advent of the Holy Father. No danger that this enthusiasm should manifest itself merely in empty demonstrations. On the contrary, even in a pecuniary respect, the enterprise would turn out an excellent speculation; and if the Pope is no rich man yet, he may be certain to be come so through the voluntary gifts of the faithful. All the servant girls and washerwomen, who now devote only perhaps the fourth part of their wages to the support of the clergy and the erection of churches and convents, would think themselves happy to contribute at least half of it for the personal benefit of his Holiness. There is, besides the faithful, a class of people here ready to pay homage to everything that comes in the shape of old traditional splendor and glory; ladies who, while in Europe, thought it an honor to be introduced to NARAIKON; whole crowds who paid servile and ridiculous homage to the Prince of Wales, who assailed and almost overwhelmed the Japanese and Chinese Embassadors with attentions and questions; and we venture to pledge ourselves that they all would be ready to lionize

the Holy Father to the best of their ability. True, he might have to undergo some trouble from their officiousness; there would be interviewers of every description, Jenkins and his relatives; and we are by no means certain that some straightforward Westerner may not express the hope "that Mrs. Pope is in good health."

Finally, after having sufficiently enjoyed the hospitalities of New York, and paid a visit to Washington, the Vicar of Christ might direct his steps westward, and there, in one of the Territories, where land is yet cheap, he would easily acquire, at a trifling cost, as much of it as to cover the whole area of the former States of the Church.

There is nothing in this country of broad toleration to prevent him from establishing a sumptuous ecclesiastical court, and as long as he would not openly defy the laws of the United States, he might have it all pretty much his own way. He could set up, as it were, in opposition to Brigham Young—celibacy against polygamy—and would, at least in this respect, have the advantage to keep within the limits of the laws. We don't even think that there would be any serious obstacle to solemn processions through the streets, since that privilege is allowed to other shows and displays, such as circuses, menageries, and the like. We hope our ecclesiastical and legal friends will consider our proposition.

The Closing Decade.

With the 31st of December, 1870, closes a decade of years that can be said, without exaggeration, to stand unrivalled "in the known account of time" with respect to the importance of events that make up the sum of its history. So says a writer in *Harper's Monthly* for January, in an article containing a highly entertaining and edifying summary of the most important events transpiring during the period including the past ten years.

The most important event, the grandest achievement among the many, has been the abolition of slavery in the United States, and the consequent elevation of the black man to the full privileges of an American citizen. This result was not reached without determined and almost overwhelming opposition; nor have the opponents of freedom and equal suffrage given up their strife against human rights and acquiesced in the inevitable. They cherish the hope that the time will yet come when they shall be able to turn back the tide of progress, and if not to re-enslave the black man, to deprive him of the exercise of the elective franchise, and reduce him to a dependent upon the will of the dominant race. This, undoubtedly, they hope, and will strive, unrelentingly, to accomplish before the close of another decade.

The conflict which is to determine whether the freedom and suffrage now extended to the black man is to be enduring will be decided in the near approaching decade—thus giving to that decade a prominence second only to the present.

On the side of the enemy are powerful weapons. Prejudice against men of color because they are men of color, and because they have been slaves, is a very effective weapon. Through a stern military and political necessity freedom and franchise came to the black man from a race that a few months before despised and hated him. As the military and political necessity seem to pass away the enemies of the black man will seek to revive the ancient hatred and prejudice against him, and through the power of his might accomplish their aim and find their gratification and revenge for having been defeated in their rebellion, in the degradation of the negro.

The weapons for defence against the attacks of the enemies of the nation and of the negro are to be found in the continued ascendancy of the Republican party, and successful efforts in getting education by the colored as well as the white people of the South.

Let the colored people of the coming decade stand shoulder to shoulder in keeping the Government in the hands of the party that saved it from ruin and gave to a whole race freedom; let them be prepared to meet all claims of their natural inferiority to other men with strong, incontrovertible testimony that they are not so inferior; by the progress they will have made in acquiring knowledge they will be enabled at the close of the next ten years to claim a share in the honors of the onward progress of the world.

Universal Amnesty.

There seems to be a well-founded fear among the truest and wisest friends of the Union, and a jubilant confidence among its enemies, that universal amnesty to the rebels of the South is in a fair way to be proclaimed by Congress. We most devoutly trust that these loyal fears and rebel hopes are not to be realized. The possibility that a policy which every man who participated in the rebellion and every enemy of the Republican party so earnestly desires and so clamorously demands may be adopted is a source of just alarm to all good men.

We are aware that there are a few honest Republicans in favor of removing the disabilities from every rebel, no matter how infamous. JEFF. DAVIS and the immediate authors of the Andersonville murders are not excepted. But the great majority of Republicans who have become the advocates of universal amnesty are those who are using it as a means of destroying the Republican party; and to that extent they are wise beyond what is written. It is not in the power of human ingenuity to invent a measure more absolutely certain to accomplish that purpose. From the day universal amnesty shall be proclaimed will date the downfall of the Republican party and the restoration of the rebel Democracy to power. It will lose us every Southern State. We have already lost Virginia and West Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, and Missouri. Of the fifteen old slave States only South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, and Arkansas are Republican. Ten of them are bitterly opposed and malignantly disloyal. We have barely saved Florida and Arkansas, and may have lost Georgia in the election which closes in that State to-day. But, whether we have been able to save it in spite of the terrorism which prevails or not, there is no more doubt that the universal enfranchisement of the rebels of those States will give them all over, bound hand and foot, to the rebel Democracy. With the fifteen Southern States immediately against us, and New York, Indiana, California, and Oregon on the same side, as certain capital to start upon in the next Presidential campaign, the chances will be largely in favor of their success.

The restoration of the rebel Democracy to power in the former slave States would be a terrible calamity to the colored population of those States. It has already proved so in Tennessee, Virginia, and other States, which have already returned to their wallowing in the mire of Democracy. But this calamity to them and the country would be but the smallest trifle compared with a national triumph. It is frightful to contemplate the consequences that would result from such a revolution in the Government of the country.

It is not our purpose, however, to enter into an argument against the fatal policy of a uni-

versal restoration of bitter, unrepentant, still treasonably-inclined rebels to all their justly forfeited rights and privileges; but only to protest against it, because we are sure it would be, as it always has been, turned against the colored race and the Government. Such leniency has never conciliated a rebel. On the contrary, they have looked upon it as a concession justly their due, and extorted from our cowardice.

We are amongst those who believe the continuance of the Republican party in power is absolutely necessary to the peace, prosperity, and welfare of the country, and, above all, to the best interests of our people. As legitimate corollary from this position, we believe in every fair and honorable means to keep it in power. And as rebels have no right to demand or even expect amnesty for their crimes, we are in favor of withholding their forfeited privileges until they give the country some proof that they have abandoned their treasonable designs. They not only forfeited their political rights, but life itself, by their treason to the country. Their lives and property have been spared. Let them do works meet for repentance before they are given the power to begin another rebellion. Those who prefer rebel to Republican rule will, of course, vote to transfer half a million of European rebels into voters. Let us see who are our friends and who are our enemies.

Nobody would be more unfortunate than that the bitter recollections of slavery should be perpetuated; nothing more to be deplored than the stirring up of resentments between those who have formerly borne the relation to each other of master and slave. As a man who had seen something of slavery, not as it existed in Baltimore, but in the States, would not shrink from the fact that he would cultivate the most friendly relations with your former master, and never let the recollection of a stripe you have received interfere with your conduct.

In discussing political questions strong arguments are made. Nothing is to be gained by indulging in hate and abusive language, whether in the party caucus or in the public meeting. While it is his duty to the people to speak the truth, and to defend the rights of his political enemies, which is already too great a duty, it is of unpardonable folly to allow his tongue to utter words which will do him no good, and which will only hurt his friends. When a man is about to speak in a public meeting, let him ask himself if he is not right, and if he is not right, let him keep his tongue shut.

The above paragraph is going the rounds of the papers, commended as excellent advice from Senator REVELS to the colored people of the South. It is like Senator REVELS. He is an amiable man, has always been free, and has, perhaps, not a "stripe" on his back to forget. Such men are apt to find it easy to forget stripes laid upon other men's backs, and can as easily exhort them to forget them. For our part, having felt the lash, and having a vivid recollection of the sensations it produced, we find it hard to forget our stripes, or to exhort others of similar experience to forget their stripes. If a man is not to remember his stripes we do not know for what the organ of memory was placed in his head. We say to the colored citizens of the United States, remember well your "stripes" when you go to the polls, and remember the class of men by whom they were laid on. There is much more reason to fear that the colored man will forget, than that he will remember, his past condition. While we live we shall endeavor to put them in mind of it, and of the lessons it teaches. The man who does not hate with an implacable hate the whole system of bondage which for two hundred and fifty years ground down his race in this country can not truly love his newly-acquired liberty, or be depended upon to properly guard that liberty. We insist upon it, and fire will not burn it out of us, that no colored voter shall either forget or forgive the men who have enslaved him until they have repented, and given evidence of that repentance by doing justice to the colored race. The kindly disposition of Senator REVELS makes him altogether too reticent—and this we say with due deference to his high position as a Senator.

The Closing of Senator Drake's Senatorial Career.

We need say nothing here of Mr. DRAKE's reply to the speech of his colleague, Mr. SCHURZ, except that it was wonderfully effective. There were moments during its delivery when the silence of the thousands assembled was solemn and even oppressive. It was not the oratory, but the honesty and profound earnestness of the man, that produced the wonderful effect, as step by step, and with almost painful deliberateness, he proceeded to dissect, not so much the speech as the political character of his assailant. There is in Mr. DRAKE no such fertility of language or logic as in his colleague, and his victory over him was due to the superiority of simple truth over learned sophistry. But enough. Mr. DRAKE leaves in the Senate the conviction that it has parted with one of its bravest, truest, and most vigilant statesmen; a man of Roman firmness, honest and incorruptible. There was something funeral like in his parting words to his brother Senators; something to make "aged eyes swim in young tears," and the heads of strong men to bow in humility, in view of the transitory nature of all human greatness and the nothingness of human glory, and that heart must have been hard indeed that did not feel deeply touched by the whole scene.

The Closing of Senator Drake's Senatorial Career.

We need say nothing here of Mr. DRAKE's reply to the speech of his colleague, Mr. SCHURZ, except that it was wonderfully effective. There were moments during its delivery when the silence of the thousands assembled was solemn and even oppressive. It was not the oratory, but the honesty and profound earnestness of the man, that produced the wonderful effect, as step by step, and with almost painful deliberateness, he proceeded to dissect, not so much the speech as the political character of his assailant. There is in Mr. DRAKE no such fertility of language or logic as in his colleague, and his victory over him was due to the superiority of simple truth over learned sophistry. But enough. Mr. DRAKE leaves in the Senate the conviction that it has parted with one of its bravest, truest, and most vigilant statesmen; a man of Roman firmness, honest and incorruptible. There was something funeral like in his parting words to his brother Senators; something to make "aged eyes swim in young tears," and the heads of strong men to bow in humility, in view of the transitory nature of all human greatness and the nothingness of human glory, and that heart must have been hard indeed that did not feel deeply touched by the whole scene.

It is said that the Hon. D. T. JEWETT, who has been appointed by Gov. McCLURE to succeed Senator DRAKE, is a gentleman about fifty years of age, originally from the State of Maine, a lawyer of decided ability, and that he will worthily fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator DRAKE.

Memorial Festival.

Though neither a Pilgrim, nor the son of a Pilgrim, nor a Pilgrim by adoption, nor by any other tie, that we know of, we confess that the descendants of the Pilgrims are a very pleasant set of people, if those assembled at Dr. RANKIN's church, (Congregational,) on Thursday evening last, are a fair sample of the class. The occasion was a memorial festival of the Pilgrims, and the points of the entertainment were both sacred and secular, and were participated in by divines, statesmen, and warriors. General HOWARD, who is all soul, was very much the soul of the occasion. That Congregational edifice, grand and imposing as it is, is an offense to the Christian churches in this city, because it is consistent in recognizing the brotherhood of man and the equality of the colored race by welcoming the people of that race to Christian communion and fellowship. The festival was made delightful by poetry, music, and eloquence. The speeches made by Senators PATTERSON, of New Hampshire, POMEROY, of Kansas, and by ex-Senator POLAND, of Vermont, were especially eloquent and impressive. We remarked that the speakers not only contended for perfect religious liberty, but for the largest liberty in all directions consistent with upright life and social order. An elegant and delicious repast was prepared by the ladies, to which we should think excellent justice was done by the whole company.

The re-election of Mr. WRIGHT to the high seat he now holds is one of the most cheering facts that has come to our notice in the brief political history of our people. This man has been tried; his qualities as a man and a judge have been tested by experience. In his case the experiment of lifting the colored race into high places of honor and trust has succeeded. The people want him again—that is enough.

National Lincoln Monument.

We take pleasure in laying before our readers the following proceedings, indicating earnest progress in the work upon one of the most deserving public enterprises of the times.

We are glad to know that the National Lincoln Monument Association is actively engaged in putting into imperishable and appropriate forms the history of the grandest period in this or any other country, and we add our cordial approval of the particular portion of the work presented below for public consideration.

STATE OF DR. H. W. BELLOWE—MEETING IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

In pursuance of notice a meeting of gentlemen friendly to this great national enterprise assembled at Washington, D. C., December 19th, 1870.

On motion, Henry A. Willard, Esq., was appointed chairman, and E. B. Elliott, Esq., secretary of the meeting. The chairman stated that the meeting had been called for the purpose of enlisting the friends of the United States Sanitary Commission in an effort to place upon the Monument the statue of Rev. Henry W. Bellows, president of said commission, as representative of the great philanthropic movement organized and led by that commission. Mr. Willard further stated that we had assembled in pursuance of a preliminary consultation held a few days since, at which a committee had been appointed to prepare resolutions and a plan of organization to be presented to this meeting; and, if no other business was proposed, he would now call for the report of that committee.

Whereupon, Hon. Geo. E. Baker, in behalf of the committee, submitted the following report:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

Whereas the National Lincoln Monument Association has resolved to incorporate among the statues composing the proposed Monument a colossal bronze statue of the Rev. Henry W. Bellows, D. D., the President of the United States Sanitary Commission, as commemorative of the great services of that commission in the national cause; and whereas we readily recognize the propriety of placing in a monument, so elaborately and so well designed, the statue of a man who, although a civilian and without office, represented in the great struggle the spontaneous philanthropy and patriotism of the people acting through an organization unrivaled in history, and contributing so much to the amelioration of the miseries of war and to the final success of the national cause: Therefore,

Resolved, That we invite our fellow-citizens in this city and throughout the Union to contribute the funds necessary to carry out the plan of the National Lincoln Monument Association.

Resolved, That we especially invite the friends of the United States Sanitary Commission to unite with us in raising the means for the construction of a statue of the Rev. Dr. Bellows, to form a part of the Monument. Resolved, That a permanent committee be appointed, by this meeting, to have the charge of raising the funds for the statue of Dr. Bellows, and who shall have power to adopt such measures as in their judgment will further the work proposed, in co-operation with the National Lincoln Monument Association.

Further, That the following named gentlemen be, and are hereby, appointed said committee: Henry A. Willard, Esq., Hon. Horatio King, Hon. Sayles J. Bowen, Hon. E. B. Elliott, Hon. Geo. E. Baker; and that said committee may add to their number, and fill any vacancies which may occur in their organization.

The report of the committee, after some discussion, was unanimously adopted, and the meeting, on motion, adjourned, to assemble again on the call of the chairman.

HENRY A. WILLARD, Chairman.

E. B. ELLIOTT, Secretary.

We have looked in vain for an explanation or a retraction from the Rev. Mr. TANNER. He has borne false witness against us; and, when informed of what he has done in the most pointed manner possible, he neither explains, denies, reaffirms, nor otherwise touches the matter at all. That is the way with these Reverend assailants. Like cowardly curs, they run after a man and bark at his heels furiously, till he puts the toe of his boot under their noisy throats, and then they skulk away in silence. This noisy fellow charged us with writing an article we never wrote, and with sentiments we never entertained, and, when his attention is called to it, instead of frankly confessing his falsehood, he goes along as if nothing had happened, and will, perhaps, preach next Sunday from the text, "Thou shalt not bear false witness;" for TANNER does not lack brass, though not over-blessed with brains. Possibly the young man is dodging behind his dignity, but that dodge comes too late. He should have thought of that before he set his foot in this affair at all. Having once ventured to give blows, it is too late to retire under his dignity when his back is covered with mud by a blow his own impertinence has provoked.

Hon. Jacob M. Howard.

We observe that the Republican papers of Michigan are discussing the claims of different candidates to succeed Mr. HOWARD in the United States Senate. The only advice we have to give in the case is, send a true and able man; for when you have sent your ablest and truest he will not be more able or more true to the Republican cause, to the interests of the nation, or those of the State than has been Senator HOWARD. We are much mistaken, too, if any man can be sent here whose influence and standing in the Senate will reach in many years the measure in these respects already attained by Jacob M. HOWARD. He has stood in the Senate through times of darkness and trouble—times that "tried men's souls"—and has never faltered, never wavered, but has been inflexible as granite in his advocacy of the noble principles of the great party that sent him here, and won for himself the praise of being an able and an honest man.

Lieutenant Governor Dunn.

We have just been honored by the presence in our sanctuary of this distinguished gentleman—the first colored Lieutenant Governor known in the United States, and one who worthily fills his station. Mr. DUNN was accompanied by Mr. GEORGE T. DOWNING, (who is now on his way to Richmond,) to whom, perhaps, we were indebted for a sight of a man we know of in the South. The few minutes of conversation we had with Mr. DUNN left upon us a highly favorable impression of the character and ability of the man. His bodily presence is weighty and imposing, and we can easily see how it is that he so entirely commands the respect of the Senate of Louisiana, over which he presides.